

2 September 1960

✓ *caud*  
Mr. Pierre Salinger  
Press Assistant to Senator Kennedy  
Room 362, Senate Office Building  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Salinger:

Reference is made to my letter of 12 August 1960 and the attachment thereto.

Mr. Dulles has asked that I forward to you for Senator Kennedy the second in the series of our memoranda covering world comment on the Republican and Democratic national tickets.

Copies have also been furnished to Vice President Nixon and Senator Lyndon Johnson.

Sincerely,

  
Executive Officer

STAT

Attachment

O/DCI:JSE:mfb


Distribution:

Orig & 1 - addressee w/att.

1 - JSE w/attch

① - ER with attch.

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE *Long*)

Attachment is  No. 2 - 31Aug60 "World Comment on Republican & Democratic National Tickets"

STAT




STAT

## SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

WORLD COMMENT ON  
REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL TICKETS

NO. 2 -- 31 AUGUST 1960



STAT

T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

COMMUNIST BLOC COMMENT

USSR	1
East Germany	12
Communist China	13

OTHER COUNTRIES

United Arab Republic	17
Japan	24
South Vietnam	24

U S S R

NEITHER PARTY CAN SPUR U.S. ECONOMY

Moscow, Soviet European Service in English, Aug. 13, 1960, 2000 GMT--L

(M. Vladimirov commentary)

(Excerpts) Not since the war have economic questions occupied such an important place in a U.S. election campaign. In this campaign the Democrats blame the Republican administration for the slowdown of economic growth. The Republicans on their part try to convince the voter that just the opposite is true, that they are the party of prosperity.

President Eisenhower told a news conference Wednesday that there are no signs of a slump or depression. On the contrary, he asserted, production has reached a record high. The Republicans vehemently deny the charges by the Democrats. In St. Louis, Vice President Nixon said that people who criticize the administration should not be taken seriously.

Now what is the true state of affairs? It is impossible to judge from the claims of the rival parties. The American economy is truly growing at a slow rate, but this does not depend on which party is in power. It depends on the laws of development of America's capitalist economy. Both the Republicans and the Democrats represent the interests of big capital. The army of unemployed has run into the millions, both during Democratic and Republican administrations.

While the two parties talk about fast and slow rates of development, the question actually is how to postpone another depression. The American economy is sliding into a state of stagnation. The contours of another economic slump are already clearly emerging. In May, the New York TIMES pointed out that the real question is not whether or not an economic catastrophe threatens the United States; it is rather a question of whether the United States, with its tremendous domestic and international commitments, would be satisfied with what suspiciously resembles economic stagnation, even if it does begin on a relatively high level. This situation has shown no improvement. If anything, it has worsened.

This is indeed a terrifying prospect for the captains of capitalist America. It is particularly terrifying because the attention of the world is focused on the economic competition between the United States and the USSR. There is no doubt about it: the Soviet Union will emerge victorious in this competition.

SEN. JACKSON SLANDERS USSR ON TESTING

Moscow, in Russian to West Siberia, Aug. 16, 1960, 1510 GMT--L

(IZVESTIYA article by /Grigoryev?/: "Neither Gold Nor Silver")

(Text) Over a month has passed since the Democratic Party Convention in Los Angeles. All that time the elected party chairman, Senator Henry Jackson, has maintained silence, probably pondering the theme of his first speech as the new party chairman. On Aug. 14 Jackson's silence came to an inglorious end. Pertinent is the saying: "Talking is silver, silence is gold." Contrary to the American way of life, Jackson on that occasion renounced gold and preferred silver, because on that day he burst out in an entire TV address.

In that speech the chairman of the Democratic Party carried on like a most mediocre journalist from the yellow press, who to please his bosses produces all kinds of nonsense, banking on the possibility that even if a denial follows, at least something will remain in the minds of the listeners. He hinted that the Soviet Union is secretly carrying out nuclear weapon tests. The Senator has no facts whatever which could corroborate his assertion; he limits himself to saying that he "would not be surprised if such tests were taking place." And that is the entire weight behind Senator Jackson's "reasoning"!

But in this case there is no reason for astonishment. Jackson is chairman of a Senate subcommittee which quite recently held a series of public and secret meetings at which the U.S. military situation in relation to the Soviet Union was discussed. There Jackson frankly stated that the United States could no longer delay a decision on the question of resumption of underground nuclear weapon tests. But since public opinion in the United States increasingly inclines toward a complete ban on any nuclear tests whatsoever, Jackson was in need of some kind of argument, and to save himself the trouble of intensive thought, he had recourse to the shoddy and well-known trick of slandering the Soviet Union in the hope that some would swallow it.

What is strange, however, is that the very same Jackson, speaking of the forthcoming elections, admitted that the Democratic Party will encounter serious obstacles in New York and California. Does he really think that his salvation lies (words indistinct) and that anti-Soviet slander will enable the Democratic Party to gain the upper hand in those states? Have not Jackson's ideas about means to fortify his party's prestige grown somewhat obsolete? After all, many in the "free world" have already paid for slander by losing, if not their heads, their prestige.

# NIXON ADMITS COMMUNISM ATTRACTIVE

Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Aug. 21, 1960, 1930 GMT--L

(TASS correspondent Shishkin report)

(Text) Washington--U.S. Vice President Nixon has published a previously publicized verbose statement entitled "What Communism Means to Americans." Appearing in the role of a self-styled expert of Marxist philosophy, Nixon gives a slanderous and caricatured treatment of the views and ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Nevertheless, the Vice President was forced to admit that the ideas of communism possess an actively attractive force for the minds and hearts of many. In all 30 pages of his propagandist statement, Nixon tries in jest to refute these ideas, but, to his obvious displeasure, he is compelled to state that communism may be personified as a country with the largest school buildings and the heaviest interplanetary satellites.

A New York POST article by William Shannon derides Nixon's statement on communism. This is a surprisingly confused, ambiguous, contradictory and superficial document, stresses Shannon. If this is the most that the Vice President can write about communism, continues the author, who considers himself a specialist on this question, one may think: What will he write about agriculture, finance, and other questions about which he is less informed?

## LODGE SCORED FOR DISARMAMENT POSITION

Moscow, Soviet European Service in Russian, Aug. 22, 1960, 1200 GMT--L

(From PRAVDA International Review by Yermakov and Pastukhov: "Lodge Beats a Retreat")

(Text) At the session of the U.N. Commission for Disarmament, which sat last week, the U.S. delegate, Lodge, experienced many unpleasant hours. At this meeting, the bubble of still another propaganda move was burst--to accuse the Soviet Union of disrupting the Geneva talks on disarmament. The attempts to drown the problem of complete and general disarmament in fruitless discussion and to prevent it from being taken to the U.N. General Assembly for discussion, as was proposed and is proposed by the Soviet Union, also failed.

The speech of the U.S. delegate was an example of impudent, demagogic, creating the impression that Lodge was speaking not in a representative international commission but at a provincial election meeting somewhere in the state of Kentucky.

The whole world knows that the talks in Geneva were broken off through the fault of the United States and its Western partners, who made fruitful discussion of the problem of complete and general disarmament, in accordance with the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly of Nov. 20, 1959, practically impossible.

Western participants in the committee hoped to draw the discussion along a false path. The problem of control over armaments was again dragged out into the light of day, and, moreover, control in such a form that Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev had every reason to call it "legalization of international espionage." The United States and its allies did not even want to hear about complete and general disarmament and the establishment of strict international control over disarmament. Even when the Soviet delegate, supported by the delegate of other socialist countries, proposed a businesslike solution of the problem, taking into consideration the wishes of France, the West refused to take a step forward.

Thus the U.S. delegate attempted in his speech to refute all these incontestable truths, but he did not succeed. More than that, many delegates straightforwardly and openly condemned the policy of sabotage of the cause of disarmament. The representative of the Cuban Republic (word indistinct) categorically stated that the responsibility for the breaking-off of the Geneva talks was borne by the United States. A sharp condemnation of the policy of the imperialist states was made by the delegate of Guinea who exposed the two-faced political game of the Western powers around the disarmament question.

The majority of the speakers demanded that discussion of the problem of general and complete disarmament be transferred to the meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. Finding himself in such an unenviable position, Lodge was forced to beat a retreat. In order not to remain alone, the U.S. delegate raised his hand when the vote was taken on the draft resolution of the six states on the transfer of the disarmament question to the U.N. General Assembly.

Voting for this resolution, Lodge did not neglect to emphasize that, in his opinion, any talks on disarmament, wherever they were held, would be fruitless. Thus, Lodge showed that the United States intends in the future to sabotage talks on disarmament.

#### NIXON, U.S. POLICIES, EARN WORLD HATRED

Moscow, in German to Germany, Aug. 24, 1960, 1245 GMT--L

(Anatoliy /Sagovskiy?/ commentary: "Rotten Tomatoes")

(Summary) In the spring of 1958, when Richard Nixon arrived at the airport of Caracas, Venezuela, he was welcomed by a hail of rotten tomatoes, rotten eggs, and stones. The crowd yelled "Out with Nixon! We have not forgotten Guatemala!" Nixon was not surprised. He had been given a similar welcome in Argentina, Peru, and Colombia.

From a purely human point of view, we pity Mr. Nixon. It is not an enviable position to be forced to walk past eyes filled with hatred and to serve as a target for all sorts of rubbish. The crux of the matter is that these rotten tomatoes were really aimed at U.S. imperialism and its policy.

"This is most annoying, but what can be done? After all, behind the many provocations and espionage incidents, behind the regimes, rotten through and through, which still maintain themselves on our planet, stand Nixon's masters. Now the face of the No. 1 spokesman of imperialist United States is looking at us from the front pages of the papers, grinning at us from posters, and raising his eyebrows on television screens. It is Mr. Nixon's bad luck that he belongs to those who personify a policy hated by the nations."

Perhaps we have made a mistake. Oh no, Mr. Nixon has not changed. Only a short while ago he was again honored with a rotten tomato as a reward for his theoretical remarks about communism. The presidential candidate made a wordy statement which he entitled "What Communism Means to Americans." In it he tried to turn the ideas of Marxism-Leninism inside out and reached the following paradoxical conclusion: "The main problem of the second half of the 20th century consists of the threat to peace and freedom of the bellicose aggressiveness of international communism." How trite this is! As if it were international communism which threatens Cuba with landings of marines, which helps the colonialists and their creature Tshombe to split the Congo, which supports Chiang Kai-shek, which demands more nuclear explosions, and which dispatches spy pilots such as Powers into the airspace of another country.

"If you do not agree with this, my listener, you do not agree with Mr. Nixon. The above-mentioned rotten tomato was thrown at Nixon by the well-known U.S. columnist William Shannon of the New York POST, who described Nixon's outpourings as astonishingly confused, ambiguous, contradictory, and superficial.

"You will agree with me that this is anything but praise. By the way, Nixon can look back on several such bright ideas. There was, for instance, the threat to use nuclear bombs and the statement that the Chinese People's Republic is an unlawful state which must not be recognized. There was the all-out support for the brink-of-war policy and the cynical admission of the U-2 spy flight."

One billion people on our planet march under the banner of communism, but Nixon does not believe in it. Hundreds of millions in all corners of the world receive every new initiative of the socialist camp with gratitude and hope, but Nixon fears it. Well, this is his private affair. However, as soon as he publicizes his plans for saving the world from communism, he reaps rotten tomatoes.



To round out our portrait of Mr. Nixon, one more facet must be mentioned. There is a proverb: Know a man by his friends. Just listen to what Rockwell, chief of the U.S. neofascist party, wrote recently: "Vote for Nixon and you will protect the U.S. Republic and the white race; and we shall do the rest for the organization of the party of the white man, the U.S. Nazi Party." True, Nixon was forced to dissociate himself from this all too compromising support. But the fact remains, nevertheless. Chancellor Adenauer, an authority in matters of fascist ideology, during his American trip in March conceived such confidence in Nixon, according to FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, that he recommended him as a suitable candidate for the post of U.S. president.

"On the crest of a wave of war incitement and anticommunism, Richard Nixon rode to the heights of top-level politics." Recently Eisenhower referred to him as "the best hope to preserve peace." The late Senator Taft described him in a different manner: "A small man in a big hurry." "Indeed, Nixon is in a hurry. Anticommunism generously remunerated by the U.S. billionaires is the sinister force which drives Mr. Nixon forward along an inglorious and, in the last resort, hopeless road--only to receive rotten tomatoes."

#### NIXON CONCERNED OVER SOVIET SUCCESSES

Moscow, TASS, Radioteletype in English to Europe, Aug. 25, 1960, 1505 GMT--L

(Text) New York--Fear of the tremendous attractive power of the socialist countries for the peoples of the countries rising to national independence and sovereignty and freeing themselves from the stranglehold of foreign monopolies permeated the speech of Vice President Nixon at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Detroit which has been published by the New York TIMES. The Vice President is plainly frightened by the success of the policy of support and unselfish aid to new nations pursued by the USSR and other socialist countries. In a roundabout way he admitted that this policy evokes the gratitude of these nations.

The Vice President declared that a conflict of two ideologies or, to use his words, "a fight for the allegiance of men and women" is going on all over the world. He admits that the chances of capitalism in this conflict are few. He fears that the United States can "still lose the battle without a shot even being fired." Attempting to prevent the new nations from freely deciding their destiny and to impose upon them the unwanted "trusteeship" of U.S. imperialism, Nixon calls for broad economic, technical, and political programs "on a scale such as we have never had before." Assuming the attitude of a benefactor, the Vice President did not desist, however, from advocating armaments. He urged top priority for security, even if this involves higher taxes. In other words, the Vice President called for an arms race at the taxpayers' expense for the sake of profits for American monopolies.

Nixon's proud voice faltered when he turned to Cuba. The Vice President, showered threats on this independent republic and declared that "we must remember that the United States has power," hinting transparently at the plans of armed intervention against Cuba which are being hatched in the United States.

#### U.S. CAMPAIGN EMPHASIZES ANTICOMMUNISM

Moscow, Soviet European Service in Hungarian, Aug. 25, 1960, 2030 GMT--1.

(Summary) "The U.S. election campaign is in full swing. Promising speeches, offering the citizens of America work, juicy steaks, and cottages in the country, have been made from convention rostrums and to tunes of brilliantly played marches. What is the result?"

A letter to the editor of the Madison, Wis., CAPITAL TIMES says that to chose between Kennedy and Nixon is tantamount to trying to leap from the 10th story of one building to the 10th story of a building across the street.

"What is the cause for this concern of the American voters? Americans are burdened by heavy taxation and they are tired of the war psychosis. They fear that the latest pretenders to the plush chair of the President have no intention whatsoever of ending the war psychosis. Nixon demands more arms. Kennedy demands the same. Statements of this kind send cold shivers down the backs of the American electors, although both parties of American capital try to justify the armaments race by talk about the alleged communist danger. The press, radio, television, and every means of propaganda besiege the electors, frightening them with the red danger.

"The German fascists, too, prepared their attack on the Soviet Union with the slogan of anticommunism. The U.S. Government has used the slogan of anticommunism to suppress the national liberation movement in Guatemala. The United States is now trying to repeat this feat in Cuba. But there is another aspect of anticommunism in America that must also be mentioned. By shouting about the so-called red danger, American generals and politicians try to justify increased arms production.

"The leading circles of the United States regard anticommunism as the prerequisite for a successful political career. Let us take Nixon, for example. Nixon wants to get into the White House and threatens to stamp out communism. Whether or not Nixon becomes president is up to the Americans. As for his plans about communism, we can only say that Nixon will prick his finger with his own needle. Adventures directed against the socialist countries these days lead more easily to broken necks than leaps from the 10th story by those who prefer adventures of this kind."

# NIXON, DULLES CONFIRM SOCIALIST GAINS

Moscow, in English to Australia and New Zealand, Aug. 26, 1960,  
1115 GMT--L

(Text) A scared person is unable to think clearly. This is the thought that comes to one's mind while reading the statements of U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon and the director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles, at the national congress of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently held in Detroit.

Both Nixon and Dulles were swayed by fear when they spoke to the congress. The United States now finds itself in a situation where all its economic and military power may prove useless. It may be strong, but it may still lose the battle without a single shot being fired, according to Mr. Nixon. Allen Dulles echoed the Vice President by speaking of the major threat hanging over the country, a greater threat than had been expected.

It is because things are going badly that Nixon and Dulles are being so outspoken. Usually Washington prefers to remain quiet about its failures but Washington's representatives have admitted that U.S. prestige is falling catastrophically. There is no doubt that 1960 will go down in the annals as a year of unprecedented ignominy for U.S. politicians. In May they sent a U-2 spy plane to violate Soviet airspace, were caught red-handed, and were called aggressors and provocators for torpedoing the summit conference. In June the people of Japan shut its doors in the face of the U.S. President in protest against the policy of military blocs and the preparations for another war. In July another U.S. spy plane, RB-47, was shot down over Soviet territorial waters. The United States is also responsible for the deadlock and breakdown of the 10-nation disarmament conference. Naturally, Nixon and Dulles avoided mentioning these events that have degraded the United States in the eyes of the world.

But something they have not been able to suppress is the fact that nations everywhere, and particularly those who are fighting for freedom and independence, are more frequently looking toward the camp of peace and socialism. The communists are making proposals that are very attractive to a large part of the world, particularly to the underdeveloped countries who are passionately seeking a way to rapid economic advancement and social progress, and words to this effect are what Allen Dulles had to say at the veterans conference in Detroit.

This magnetic force emanating from the socialist countries is especially attractive to the nations struggling for their independence and a particular source of fury to Washington, including Nixon and Dulles, and not only fury, but panic. That is a bad frame of mind for planning future U.S. foreign policy. In his attempts to save the badly shaken prestige of the country Nixon still could not find any better way to bolster it than to make demands for a continued arms race. In his

hypocritical meanderings about America's role of guarding the peace of other nations he hinted that it might not be a bad idea for the United States to extend an armed hand toward Cuba and strangle the revolution.

What is to be said about these statements by Richard Nixon and Allen Dulles, representing the angry outbursts of the avowed advocates of the cold war? Well, in the first place, it should be pointed out to Washington's prominent leaders that it is about time they understood that neither atomic bombs nor any other kind of threats or slanderous statements about communism will retard the mighty people's movement toward independence, and certainly all of this will not frighten the USSR or any of the socialist countries.

Another thing Washington should remember is that the policy of continued aggravation of the cold war will bring no laurels to U.S. foreign policy, nor will it win the sympathy of the people. It can only serve to expose once again the ruling circles of the United States as aggressors and enemies of peace and liberty.

#### NIXON TREATISE SHOWS SPIRITUAL POVERTY

Moscow, TASS, Radioteletype in Russian to Europe, Aug. 28, 1960,  
0027 GMT--L

(Text) Moscow--SOVIET RUSSIA publishes a pamphlet by I. Aleksandrov on the pamphlet "What Communism Means to Americans," written by U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon. He calls the ideas expressed in this work "delirious fabrications." The author of the pamphlet declares that the unseemly state of affairs in these fabrications is obvious.

In his booklet Nixon, he says, promises "to discuss communism as an idea-- its economic philosophy, its philosophy of law and politics, its philosophy of history." Poor Nixon! He has shouldered a burden which is clearly beyond his strength. With the exception of a few quotations from the Communist Manifesto, which is interpreted incorrectly, the rest is old hackneyed rubbish of bourgeois propaganda, gross falsehoods, and ignorant statements. The cloak of "a theoretician" turned out to be a pitiful lot of rags and tatters.

In reading Nixon's pamphlet one marvels at the spiritual poverty of present-day critics of Marxism, Aleksandrov continues. Apparently things are going badly for the organizers of anticommunist propaganda if they are compelled to put into motion a pitiful and at the same time ridiculously pretentious concoction. But this concoction also speaks of something else: the ideological enemies of communism are prepared to tell any lie, prepared for the grossest perversion of facts if only they can slander communism and slow down its mighty spread of ideas.

However, lies have short legs. How many rejectors of Marxism are already lying on the dump heap of history while communism continues its conquering procession across our planet. No Nixons can arrest this procession which carries freedom and happiness for all of mankind.

KHRUSHCHEV EVALUATES NIXON, KENNEDY

Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Aug. 30, 1960, 2005 GMT--L

(From remarks made to Soviet and Hungarian newspapermen after visiting the Hungarian industrial exhibition in Moscow, as read by announcer)

(Excerpts) The socialist countries are linked by brotherly ties and are guided by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in their progress. The Hungarians, the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, the Hungarian Government, the CPSU, the Soviet Government, and all the Soviet people are completely unanimous in their views on the present, the morrow, and the more distant future. Our goal is communism, and communism will triumph, whatever the resistance and efforts of our enemies.

You can therefore very well imagine how perturbed I am by the program of anticommunism evolved by Mr. Nixon. More than 100 years after Marxism was created, he apparently wants to be the first genius of the capitalist world to show how communism can be destroyed. (Laughter) Yes, this is not the first time that we laugh at such theoreticians. Let us have another laugh.

Mr. Nixon wants to be the next U.S. president. Well, if he is elected president, he can have my wishes. I hope that he lives to see the day when he will have to blush for the things he invented about communism. It is possible that his children, certainly his grandchildren, will live under communism. This will be accomplished not by us--not by Russian or Hungarian communists. This will be accomplished by the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia of the United States.

Mr. Nixon has, as it were, donned the garments of champion of anticommunism. Well, he is not the first to don the anticommunist mantle, and he will not be the first to demonstrate that this mantle will not conceal the nakedness of the capitalist world and its sores.

I would like to be correctly understood. Our people might think that I am against Nixon and for Kennedy, the candidate of the other party. In the United States, they say that Nixon is most suited for the presidency because he is better able to argue with Khrushchev. He is regarded over there as an expert on communism. All right, we are not going to raise any objection to this kind of master of argument. (Laughter) You know how the Zaporozhy cossacks laughed at their adversaries when they wrote their letter to the Turkish sultan. (Laughter) This is how we shall laugh at the ideas expressed in Nixon's anticommunist program.

I know less about Mr. Kennedy. I met him when I was in Washington and exchanged a few remarks with him. However, I do know that both Nixon and Kennedy represent big business in America. They are both servants of monopolistic capital, and for this reason we

here have no choice. This, as the Russian saying goes, is a couple of boots making a pair. (Laughter) Which of them is better, the right or left boot? The left or right boot? It is difficult to judge.

The main thing is that we are not living at the mercy of our rich neighbors. The Soviet Union saw the light in the October Revolution through the efforts of the working people. Our Soviet country has outlived Wilson, however, and other presidents. The best period in our relations with the United States was during the presidency of Roosevelt, and we have great respect for his memory.

As to who will be the next president, Kennedy or Nixon, this is something that the American electorate will decide. However, irrespective of who will become U.S. president, the great cause of socialism will relentlessly move ahead. For Nixon, with his program of anticommunism, a nice big puddle must be readied in which he will have to sit with his prophecies.

Kennedy, too, is competing in anticommunism. So have Eisenhower and Nixon on policy--a policy which has completely collapsed. If the next president is Nixon, he will be no better than Eisenhower. Consequently, the results will evidently be the same. If the next president is Kennedy, will it be better or worse? I would like to refrain from commenting on this question, because, if we examine the programs of the Republicans and Democrats, it will be seen that they differ little. Both are built on anticommunism.

What we want is reasonable, sound, and good relations with the American people. The president who strives most for this will be the best president. However, if they elect a president who conducts the same policy as Eisenhower and Nixon have been pursuing, we are not going to be overcome with grief either. After all, with Eisenhower in office, we have not done too badly. Our successes do not depend on them. They depend entirely on our people.

I wanted to say this in order that people would not say that I sympathize with one presidential candidate and do not sympathize with the other. I would, of course, prefer as U.S. president the most progressive person--a communist. Communists have a correct understanding of the development of society. At present, however, conditions have not yet matured for this. However, tomorrow they will mature. When this tomorrow arrives--in how many years--is another question. However, come it will despite everything, for the future is with communism.

E A S T G E R M A N Y

LODGE CONGO VOTE LINKED TO ELECTION

Berlin, Deutschlandsender in German to East and West Germany,  
Aug. 11, 1960, 1610 GMT--L

(Albert Reiss commentary)

(Excerpts) Our attention is centered on whether the leading U.N. officials and Hammarskjöld intend to continue the maneuvers they began last week. According to the last Security Council decision there is no protest at all to U.N. troops entering Katanga. No one can believe the Secretary General to be so naive as to observe Tshombe's argument that the United Nations should enter Katanga only if the action does not interfere in the internal affairs of the province--we ought to say more correctly, in the internal affairs of the Union Minière.

Katanga is a province of the Congo Republic, and the question thus comes under the jurisdiction of the central Congolese Government of Lumumba. The real question is: Do the U.N. troops and the Secretary General intend to comply with their assignment, or do they intend to continue to maneuver in the interest of the Belgian, American, and West German monopolies?

People in Brussels are of course incensed because the American representative in the Security Council also voted for the withdrawal of the Belgian troops, but they can calm down. This anticolonialism of the Americans is not so dangerous as it is said to be.

I think the DEUTSCHE ZEITUNG is right when it states: "When Lodge joined the demand in the Security Council for the immediate withdrawal of the Belgians we do not perhaps have to take it so literally. Lodge is a candidate for the vice presidency and needs the colored vote."

C O M M U N I S T   C H I N A

U.S. 'ELECTION' A CONTEST OF DICTATORS

Peking, International Service in Cambodian, Aug. 11, 1960, 1230 GMT--S

(Commentary: "Championship for the Imperialist Dollars' Throne")

(Text) The curtain has risen on the comic opera designed to boost the election of the president of the United States--an election which is scheduled to take place every four years. We all know that the U.S. president will be selected by the imperialists from the two candidates designated by the Republican and Democratic parties. These two candidates are dictators.

It is expected that the election this time will not be different from previous ones. Nixon, the Republican candidate and now vice president of the United States, has a bad reputation among all circles, and as a person determined to make every effort to intensify the cold war. In 1948, he was elected to the House of Representatives through the backing of a secret society in Los Angeles. In 1950, he was elected to the Senate. His record as a senator shows that he only served the interests of his big bosses.

It was Nixon who approved a drastic cut in the government's housing program expenditures for the poor, thus reducing the number of houses to be built from 50,000 to 5,000. It was Nixon who collaborated with a certain senator to introduce a bill suppressing the building of public housing. All this proves that he only wanted to serve the dictators.

Moreover, he maneuvered to obtain the Senate's approval of a bill concerning the interests of oil refineries (words indistinct). This proved that he served the interests of oil magnates. In 1952, supported by political bosses of California and by Wall Street magnates, Nixon was elected vice president; thus, he was entitled to vote in Congress.

He is always in favor of bills and projects which protect the interests of big enterprise and is against small enterprises. He has opposed the bill proposed by the Labor Department on the rights of U.S. workers by advancing the argument that it would give workers more opportunities to go on strike. He has always urged the government to increase military effectiveness. Sometimes, he also talks about peace.

Following the torpedoing of the summit conference by the Americans, Nixon unmasked his true face by saying that the differences between the USSR and the United States could only be solved by war. In his statement, he shouted loudly, like a fool, that the United States must increase its military effectiveness and prepare for war, because the Americans wanted to square up accounts with socialist countries.



The policy of Democratic presidential candidate Kennedy is as tough as that of his opponent. Kennedy was born in Boston of a prominent family. He is the son of Joseph Kennedy, one of the 75 multimillionaires in the United States. It was through his father's influence and persuasion that Kennedy went into politics. Supported by his father, Kennedy was elected to the House of Representatives in 1946.

In 1952, Kennedy paid half a million U.S. dollars to a Boston paper to launch a propaganda campaign in support of his running for the Senate. The moment he was elected to the Senate he collaborated with another senator named McCarthy. Everyone knew that McCarthy was a dirty politician who threatened government officials and wanted them to obey his orders. When McCarthy proposed an increase in the expenditures and members of an investigating committee charged with investigating the activities of certain people and condemning them, Kennedy immediately seconded his proposal. In fact, Kennedy approved every proposal made by McCarthy. In 1954, forced by public and world opinion, the Congress exposed McCarthy's illegal activities and ousted him despite Kennedy's objection. In 1959, Kennedy introduced a bill called the "Kennedy-Irvin" bill. According to this law, the Labor Department must force all trade unions to submit their reports of activities and documents to be sent to the capitalists for reference.

In his policy speech, Kennedy presented a 12-point program for increasing U.S. military effectiveness and for maintaining hostile relations with China and the Soviet Union. He proposed an increase in military expenditures of some 2.5 to 3 billion dollars.

This indicates that he is striving to satisfy the desire of multi-millionaire dictator Rockefeller. This is exactly what Rockefeller wanted. Thus, it is clear that no matter which party wins, U.S. policy will not change. Whether Nixon or Kennedy is elected U.S. President, they will be nothing but lackeys to millionaire dictators. Anyone who ventures the opinion that the next U.S. President will be a clear-sighted person capable of changing the U.S. policy of aggression must surely be classed as a lunatic who does not face reality.

#### KENNEDY FAMILY SPENDS FREELY FOR VOTES

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia,  
Aug. 22, 1960, 1119 GMT--B

(Text) Peking, Aug. 22--The family of the U.S. Democratic Party presidential candidate, John F. Kennedy, has already spent millions of dollars of its wealth in an effort to buy votes for him, revealed Republican Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania yesterday, according to a Washington report. "Estimates vary between a million and a half and 7 million dollars already used," he said, adding, "I am sure that millions more will be used...." (Ellipsis as received) Kennedy's father is one

of the 75 biggest monopoly capitalists in the United States. However, Republican Senator Scott failed to reveal that the Republican Party's presidential candidate, Richard Nixon, is also backed by powerful monopoly groups which likewise contribute millions of dollars to buy votes for Nixon.

#### NIXON, KENNEDY, ARMY FUSH WAR DRIVE

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia,  
Aug. 27, 1960, 1530 GMT--W

(Text) Peking, Aug. 27--The presidential candidates of the U.S. Democratic and Republican parties, John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon, continue to advocate a "position of strength" policy and stepped-up war preparations in their election campaign, according to Washington reports.

In his address before the U.S. Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Detroit yesterday, the Democratic presidential nominee, Kennedy, disregarding the bankruptcy of the U.S. policy of strength, frenziedly called for arms expansion by the United States "regardless of what it will cost." He lamented the fact that the United States "never has experienced such a critical decline in prestige" as today, that its "leadership" is "slipping away," and that the "balance of world power is slowly shifting to" the socialist camp.

Kennedy said: "Communist power has been, and is now, growing faster than is our own. And by communist power, I mean military power, economic power, scientific and educational power, and political power." The next president, whoever he may be, should send to Congress specific requests such as acceleration of missile programs, expansion and modernization of conventional armed forces, protection of "retaliatory capacity," and streamlining of the military establishment, he said.

Addressing the same gathering Aug. 24, Republican presidential nominee Nixon also advocated arms expansion. He demanded that the United States "must always maintain" the "strength to destroy the war-making resources of a potential enemy."

Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke and Air Force Secretary Dudley Sharp, speaking at the same convention Thursday, made it a point to boast of U.S. military strength. Burke declared that the submarines carrying Polaris missiles possessed "right now" by the United States "can zero in with pinpoint accuracy on nearly every major target in communist territory." Sharp asserted that the U.S. strategic bomber force "can penetrate any enemy defense."

U.S. Air Force Vice Chief of Staff Curtis Lemay advocated in Fort Worth, Texas, today that the United States concentrate money and effort on a "counterforce" built around land-based missiles and bombers. He said that victories can only be won through "offensive actions." "Therefore, our strategic...(NCNA ellipsis) forces must possess a restrike capability. We must be prepared to fight a war...(NCNA ellipsis)."

The joint committee of the U.S. Senate and House yesterday approved a foreign "aid" bill appropriating more than 3.7 billion dollars during fiscal year 1961. Of this amount, 1.8 billion dollars will be used for direct military "aid" to U.S. military "allies," and 640 million dollars for indirect military "aid." However, the U.S. Government still considers the amount of this appropriation as inadequate. In letters to the leaders of the Senate and the House on the same day, Eisenhower asked Congress to appropriate more than 4 billion dollars for these purposes. He said in his letter that the "free world security programs, economic and military, must be kept continuously adequate."

O T H E R   C O U N T R I E S

United Arab Republic

KENNEDY WOULD RETAIN PRO-JEWISH BIAS

Cairo, Egyptian Home Service, Aug. 19, 1960, 0500 GMT--M

(Excerpt) AL-JUMHURIYAH comments on the statements made by John Kennedy, Democratic nominee in the American presidential elections, regarding the state of affairs between the Arab states and Israel and his attempts to obtain Jewish votes. Under the headline "No, Mr. Kennedy," the newspaper says: "It seems that the United States does not intend to change its policy even if it replaces Eisenhower with John Kennedy in running its foreign policy. Kennedy thinks like Eisenhower and Truman. He does not use his own brains but is tied to the mentality of the White House."

AL-JUMHURIYAH continues: "The United States, whether thinking with the mentality of Eisenhower, Truman, or Kennedy, does not want to understand that Cairo is the capital of the UAR and that political trends here are planned within the precincts of Cairo. These political trends do not come in a diplomatic pouch or through an ambassador. Cairo is no longer ruled from outside. No world force whatever can dictate to Cairo a decision which is unacceptable to it nor make it give up a decision which it has adopted."

The newspaper adds: "Kennedy, who is trying to obtain Jewish votes, bows before everything which is Jewish, upholds Zionist advocations, and prays in every Zionist synagogue. Kennedy, during his election campaign, has written to Rabbi Israel Goldstein, honorary vice president of the Liberal Party, saying that the United States should exert strong efforts to persuade the Arab states to give up the state of war and begin peace talks with Israel. This is what I will try to undertake if I am elected president of the United States, he said. Kennedy promises the Jews that he will impose peace on the Arabs and tries to restore to the region Dulles' policy and Eisenhower's mentality. This is nothing new, Mr. Kennedy.

"He does not have the courage to say, for instance, that he will restore to one million refugees their rights usurped by Israel, that he will restore to the Palestinians their land which has been stolen by Israel, and that he himself will call for implementation of the U.N. resolutions on the Palestine problem. Kennedy said nothing of the sort because he is begging for votes and the beggar does not know courage. He extends his hand to every Zionist, begging for his vote."

AL-JUMHURIYAH continues: "Understand, Mr. Kennedy, that you can say such words for local consumption, but you will not be able or dare to export such words. You cannot, Mr. Kennedy, impose any decision or any desire on the Arabs. Understand, Mr. Kennedy, you cannot be more stupid than all those who have preceded you. They have all failed to impose a single decision on the Arabs. Although they have succeeded in creating a loophole or sowing treason in the dreadful wall which separates us from Israel--the wall of hatred, rancor, detestation and blood--they have never been able to pull down this wall. You, too, Mr. Kennedy, will not be able to pull down this wall."

#### U.S. ELECTION CAMPAIGN STANDS DECRIED

Cairo, MENA, Radioteletype in Arabic to the Near East, Aug. 25, 1960, 0608 GMT--M

(Text) AL-JUMHURIYAH writes Aug. 25 in an article entitled "Shakespeareans" that history, unhappily, will rule that Dwight Eisenhower, the American president whose term of office will end in two months, was--both to the East (ash-sharq) and to the world--less harmful and mischievous and wiser than any American president-to-be, despite all his wrongs, misgivings, and misconstructions, despite the crises and dangers to which he has exposed the world.

"What a good man is Eisenhower, compared with Kennedy or Nixon. These two come out daily with electioneering platforms worked so as to glorify the military power which America should build up to face the Soviet Union or marveling at the economic invasion which would counter or destroy the Soviet economy, not to mention their fawning on our Zionist enemies.

The paper refers to the letter sent by Democratic candidate Kennedy to Jewish Rabbi Goldstein, deputy leader of the American Jewish Liberal Party, in which he told him that, should he win the elections, he would seek to tackle the Arab-Israeli dispute by inviting Arabs and Jews to hold direct negotiations to settle their problems (few words indistinct) of the two sides an opportunity to have any (word indistinct) superiority over the other.

The paper says in conclusion that the statements of American leaders today are no more than (several words indistinct) Shakespeare and that the time will come when they realize that the future of the Arab East will be determined by its people only and that the Arab-Israeli dispute will not be ended at a roundtable in Washington but in a bloody battle in Tel Aviv.

## U.S. POLITICIANS 'TOOLS' OF ZIONISM

Cairo, Egyptian Home Service, Aug. 25, 1960, 1730 GMT--M

(Yahya Abu Bakr commentary: "The slippery road of hypocrisy in the American political campaign")

(Summary) Many liberated peoples have a different opinion about politics and diplomacy from the imperialists, opportunists, or the hypocrites. The policy which was considered successful around the end of the 19th century--because it was successful in oppressing the people and dominating their lands--is now considered a policy of aggression and usurpation.

The model politics and diplomacy of 1960 is the diplomacy of frankness and straightforwardness. "Had the responsible politicians in certain big states followed the policy of frankness and a diplomacy in line with the standard of the development of national maturity, in 1960 we would not have witnessed problems such as those of Palestine, Algeria, or the prevailing crisis in the Congo."

Reports from New York speak of the fierce competition between the American Democratic and Republican parties in the presidential elections. At the same time, an American Zionist conference is taking place in New York. Those who organized this conference are aware that the American presidential elections are drawing near. They know an easy way of exploiting the situation to achieve their ambitions.

"The organizers also know the weakness of the American politicians. In the past they exploited this to the maximum. Because of this weakness, among the foremost questions which the Zionist conference will discuss is American policy toward the Middle East and Israel. The hypocritical American politicians will soon become involved in discussing this question, attempting to win over the Zionist votes by supporting Israel and closing their eyes to the very clear facts in the Middle East and the rest of Africa and Asia.

"We shall not be surprised to see a person such as Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, or Nixon, the Republican candidate, become a tool in the service of Zionist ambitions. On many previous occasions they have shown their subservience to the directions of world Zionism."

They cannot be unaware of the history of Zionism or the history of Israel from 1948 to the present. It is impossible that they have not been informed about the mistakes which were committed by their predecessors among the American politicians who followed the instructions of world Zionism. The important thing, which every hypocrite caught in the Zionist current forgets, is the huge power which has become available to the people of the Middle East and the rest of Africa and Asia. This power can solve all the problems which imperialist hypocrisy has made complicated.

It is certain that the hypocritical politicians, while discussing Palestine and the Middle East problems, look at them from Israel's angle and listen to its allegations. The question of 1 million Palestinian refugees is ignored by the hypocrites. "The most important thing is that they should understand the truth, which they can neither change nor hide--that is, that the Palestine problem cannot be solved by the American Republican Party or the Democratic Party. The people are no longer deceived by hypocrisy."

#### KENNEDY PROPOSALS ON MIDEAST SCORED

Cairo, Egyptian Home Service, Aug. 26, 1960, 1730 GMT--M

(From "We and the World" program)

(Excerpts) Khalid Darwazah of Lebanon and Sahl Abd al-Muti of Heliopolis ask about the American Democrats' policy toward Israel. Senator John Kennedy, the Democratic presidential candidate, yesterday presented his proposed policy toward the Middle East to the American Zionist organization. He based this policy on three points: 1) that states sign a guarantee for the use of the necessary military force to check any aggression in the Middle East; 2) that America should endeavor to impose peace between the Arabs and Israel; and 3) that America should assume the role of leadership and not be satisfied with what he called the role of rhetoric and oratory, with which Eisenhower was satisfied in the Middle East, according to Kennedy.

The three promises which Kennedy made in return for Jewish votes are no more than a continuation of the Eisenhower doctrine, the Baghdad Pact, and the tripartite declaration of 1950 regarding military and political trusteeship of the area. The Republican government exercised all these powers which Kennedy and his Democratic Party advocated yesterday. The Republican government was not satisfied, as Kennedy alleged, with rhetoric and oratory.

However, Kennedy began his speech with a sentence which we should complete for him. He said: "American intervention in the area will not be easy, because the record of the United States cannot now be referred to with pride." We will finish this for Kennedy by saying that the U.S. record cannot be referred to with pride simply because of the Republican government's attempt to implement the three promises with which he bound himself at the Zionist conference. The United States tried to assume the role of leadership by creating the Eisenhower doctrine, which gives it the initiative in using force to check what Washington might consider an aggression.

America's allies also tried by means of armed military aggression to achieve the objective to which Kennedy now refers--that is, Israel's passage through the Suez Canal. All these attempts were made by the

Republicans. Eisenhower's policy was not, as Kennedy described it, satisfied with oratory and rhetoric. The Republicans made practical and violent abortive attempts which should have blocked the way in face of all the promises Kennedy makes to purchase a few votes from Zionism in order to propel himself into the presidency.

Kennedy is now doing no more than walking the same path as the Republican Party leaders. But when Kennedy gives pledges to the Zionist conference, he does not take into consideration the fact that he is thereby drawing up an anti-American policy. By laying down a policy prejudiced in favor of Israel, he simultaneously lays down a policy that antagonizes 100 million Arabs. The Arabs adhere to the principle of replying in kind to those who antagonize them. When Kennedy calls for certain states to sign a pact for the employment of necessary military force to check any aggression in the Middle East, he gives the other bloc an opportunity to sign a pact for the use of military force to check any aggression in Latin America, such as aggression against Cuba or the violation of Panamanian rights.

John Kennedy contradicts himself when he advocates trusteeship for the Middle East while simultaneously alleging his respect for the United Nations and its capability in dealing with matters. He also contradicts himself when he alleges that his party respects the U.N. resolutions, yet does not ask Israel to implement the resolutions of the international organization regarding the return and compensation of the Arab refugees, and the 1948 resolution regarding the partition of Palestine. The Zionist conference bargains with Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, and Nixon, the Republican candidate, to push America onto the same plane on which Israel now stands toward the Arabs.

As to our reply, we say that President Nasir already gave it when he said that "if the parties in the United States today come begging to Zionism, let them say what they like. Our policy here is drawn up by ourselves. It is not drawn up by the Democratic or Republican parties in America. This state of affairs ended a long time ago. No one can push back history. We have declared clearly that we will recover the rights of the Palestinian people. These rights will not be lost under any circumstances."

#### KENNEDY MISUNDERSTANDS MIDEAST ISSUES

(Editor's Note--M) Cairo papers, as reported by the home service press reviews, discuss U.S. presidential candidate Kennedy's statements on the Middle East. Under the headline "Begging for Votes," AL-AHRAM says on Aug. 27: "Any presidential nominee in the United States can beg for Zionist votes. This is his own concern. The Arabs are now used to seeing nominees for the White House courting the friendship of Zionism before every election and buying Jewish votes in return for promises to adopt a Zionist viewpoint in U.S. diplomacy, especially regarding the



Middle East. The Arabs are used to all this and it is not strange to see Democratic presidential nominee John Kennedy follow in the wake of his predecessors.

"Yesterday Kennedy stood before the American Zionist conference and spoke about his program. Naturally the program ignored established Arab rights and disavowed the Palestine question and the U.N. resolutions on it. Kennedy's speech was in line with Zionist objectives, because he expects Zionism to place him in the presidential seat in Washington.

"However, Kennedy mentioned in his speech that immediately upon being elected president he would endeavor to strengthen peace. He said he would use force as rapidly as possible to check aggression committed by any state in the Middle East. These words prove that Kennedy contradicts himself and that he does not quite appreciate the nature of the question he was speaking on. Furthermore, the words imply capriciousness and partiality which have blinded him from the path of justice and good appreciation.

"Had Kennedy been impartial and just, he would have said something else. He would have said that he would immediately use force as rapidly as possible to implement the U.N. resolutions on Palestine. This would strengthen peace in the Middle East. He should have said that the chances for peace cannot be increased in the region unless rights are restored to their rightful owners and 1 million refugees are returned to their homeland. However, bias, personal interest, and misunderstanding of the true situation in the Middle East have made Kennedy tackle the Palestine issue, which is considered the most serious Arab issue and the biggest problem in the Middle East.

"At any rate the Arabs do not care if American nominees continue to take up the Palestine problem in their domestic propaganda nor do they pay any attention to Kennedy's promises to Zionist organizations. This is the concern of the Americans alone, for the Arabs know the correct solution for the Palestine question. Middle East policy emanates from the heart of this sensitive part of the world."

#### CANDIDATES AGENTS FOR WORLD ZIONISM

Cairo, Egyptian Home Service, Aug. 28, 1960, 1730 GMT--M

(Text) Republican presidential candidate Richard Nixon yesterday entered the field of cheap bargaining with world Zionism, as his colleague John Kennedy had done previously. In his message to the American Zionist organization conference in New York, Nixon pledged to exert efforts to secure freedom of Israeli navigation through the Suez Canal. He also pledged to supply Israel with American economic aid. However, he was not content with this. Explaining the causes of the explosive situation in the area, he said that the dispute between the Arab states and Israel had become more aggravated as a result of Soviet arms deals.

Nixon forgot that we obtained arms only to defend ourselves and our entity and future against imperialist and Israeli plots. This was clearly apparent during the tripartite aggression against us in 1956.

While speaking of the tense situation in the Middle East and demanding freedom of navigation for Israeli ships through the Suez Canal, Nixon forgot that all this resulted from Israel's establishment as a base for imperialism and aggression in the area, its refusal to implement the U.N. resolutions, repeated attacks by the Zionist gangs, and its attempt to forcibly divert the Jordan River. Nixon now pledges to solve this problem.

It is most regrettable that senior American politicians have turned into agents for world Zionism, and that in the welter of the election battle they have abandoned all principles of international justice.

#### KENNEDY STATEMENTS THREATEN ARAB FUTURE

Cairo, MENA, Radioteletype in Arabic to the Near East, Aug. 29, 1960, 0700 GMT--M

(Text) Cairo--Under the heading "Friends and Enemies" AL-JUMHURIYAH says today: "Russia has given us a loan of 900 million rubles for the High Dam, while America gave us 900,000 Palestinian refugees. Russia gave us experts and officials and America gave us spies and plotters. Russia gave welfare for our country, water for our desert, and experience for our workers, and America gave us the statements of Democratic candidate Kennedy--statements against us and against our future and freedom."

The paper continues: "Russia cooperated with the Arabs on the basis of equality, noninterference, and full respect for sovereignty, while America cooperated with Jordan on the basis of observation, interference, and imposition of a certain policy aimed at antagonizing the Arabs, making peace with Israel, and causing Jordan to leave the Arab ranks. At all international conferences Russia was on our side, while America, with the parade of satellites behind it, was against us. In all crises and trends Russia sides with us and America stands against us."

The paper concludes: "We are no longer standing at the crossroads. The dawn has arrived and we have seen who is the friend and who is the enemy, and who is near and who is far. We have seen hands applauding us and hands raising daggers against us. In the light of this dawn we have marched on to plan our policy, define our trends, and confirm our existence in this world."

Japan

U.S. ELECTIONS TO PRODUCE LITTLE CHANGE

Tokyo, SANKEI, in Japanese, Aug. 14, 1960, Morning Edition--T

("Voiceless Voice" column)

(Summary) The American presidential election has virtually started and will soon be in full swing. One of the issues in the election is the alternative of planned economy or free economy. If the Republican Party wins the election, it will mean a victory for free economy, while a Democratic Party victory in the election will mean an approach to planned economy.

But the planned economy of the Democrats means nothing but an increase in government investments, while Republican free economy no longer means laissez-faire policies. There is little difference between them since both mean a mixed economy and both aim at the improvement of living standards. There is no gulf between them. Whether the Republican Party or Democratic Party wins the election, there will be little difference either to the American people or to the whole world.

The conflict between conservatism and socialism is no longer revolutionary. In West Germany and Austria, Marxism has been scrapped like a worn-out sandal. The poles are approaching each other and everywhere the geometrical center is science, which is constantly attracting the poles to itself. There will emerge new economic commonsense from here, which will become the basis for new political commonsense. In short, the age of revolution is being replaced by the age of innovation.

South Vietnam

NIXON'S EXPERIENCE, POLICY GREAT ASSET

Press Review, Aug. 25

SUN YUEH JIH PAO, commenting on Nixon and Kennedy, says: "With respect to political experience, Kennedy cannot compare with Nixon, whose eight-year role as U.S. vice president has taught him how to face reality. Thus, his platform policies and lines are more concrete and realistic than Kennedy's. Concerning their attitude toward the Soviet Union, Nixon is determined to ask the USSR to put its cards on the table when conditions so require, while Kennedy, in his attack on Eisenhower's handling of the U-2 incident, clearly indicates he is afraid of the Soviet Union."

The paper continues: "Moreover, their views toward the so-called China problem are entirely different. While Nixon strongly opposes Communist China's participation in any international meeting and affirms his continued support for Nationalist China, Kennedy favors the establishment of an independent China in Taiwan and the participation of Communist China in the United Nations and in the ten-nation disarmament talks."